

Appl. No. 09/787,126

REMARKS**1. Interview of September 1, 2005**

An interview was conducted with Applicants' representative on September 1, 2005 to discuss the rejections in the final Office Action of January 31, 2005, which rejections were maintained in the Advisory Action of August 18, 2005.

As indicated in the Interview Summary form, the interview focused on the objections of record under 35 USC 112 (the only objections of record), in which the Applicants discussed the amendments of the claims as proposed in the response filed on July 29, 2005. During the interview, the Examiners raised a question as to whether claim 1 distinguished over the native OPGL polypeptide. In response, it is noted that the modified OPGL polypeptide of formula I must contain at least one modification in the form of at least one foreign T helper lymphocyte epitope, which thereby distinguishes from the native OPGL polypeptide. The claim requires that if there are no optional side groups (namely side groups in the form of T_H lymphocyte epitopes) then at least one of "s_i-s_x" must be greater than or equal to 1. Thus, the claim requires that one of MOD₁-MOD_x must be present and/or at least one OPGL subsequence must contain a foreign side group in the form of at least one foreign T helper lymphocyte epitope.

Applicants submit, therefore, that the claims do indeed distinguish over the native OPGL polypeptide.

Appl. No. 09/787,126

2. Rejections of Record

The only rejections of record of the claims are with respect to enablement and written description under section 112. Applicants have responded to those rejections in the response filed on July 29, 2005, which will be entered with the filing of this continued examination application.

Finally, Applicants have added to the application some further claims directed to particular aspects of the invention. Applicants submit that these claims are well supported by the original claims and are, therefore, fully proper under 35 USC 112.

Therefore, Applicants submit that for the above reasons and those set forth in the response filed on July 29, 2005, the claims now define Applicants invention in full compliance with 35 USC 102, 103 and 112, so that the application should be passed to issue.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP


By 

Leonard R. Svensson, #30,330

LRS/lmt
4614-0105P

Attachment(s)

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(714) 708-8555

Certificate of Transmittal
I hereby Certify that this correspondence is being
facsimile transmitted to the Patent and
Trademark Office:
On September 29, 2005

Lori M. Tillman
Typed or printed name of person signing certificate